DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 483 UD 009 503

AUTHOR	Heath, Allen J.
TITLE	Title I, ESEA in the State of Vermont: An Evaluation for Fiscal Year 1969. Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	Vermont State Dept. of Education, Montpelier.
PUB DATE	15 Nov 69
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement Gains, Administrative Change, Community Involvement, Compensatory Education Programs, *Educationally Disadvantaged, Educational Resources, *Elementary Education, Elementary School Students, Parent Participation, Private Schools, *Secondary Education, Secondary School Students, Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, Vermont

ABSTRACT

This annual report evaluates the programs run by the Vermont State Department of Education for educationally disadvantaged children. The report comprises a general introduction highlighting the operations of these programs: a descriptive summary including such items as basic statistics, staff visits, changes in State Agency procedures, effect upon educational achievement, effect upon administrative structure and educational practices, additional efforts to help the disadvantaged, success of Title I in non-public schools, coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs, community and parent involvement, and comprehensive test data, including tables of inferential statistics for grades two, four, six, and eight. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (JM)

ED037483

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

09503 E

TITLE I, ESEA

IN THE STATE OF VERMONT

AN EVALUATION
for
Fiscal Year 1969

Annual report

by

Allan J. Heath

STATE OF VERMONT
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION
MONTPELIER, VERMONT

November 15, 1969

UD 009 503

STATE OF VERMONT

GOVERNOR - DEANE C. DAVIS

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

1969

Mrs. Marion F. Taylor, Chairman.....Bennington

Dr. Robert Corley.....Wolcott

Mr. E. Dean Finney.....St. Johnsbury

Mrs. Arline Pat Hunt.....West Charleston

Mrs. Mary P. Miller.....Waterbury Center

Mr. Robert S. Jones.....Springfield

Mr. John F. Willson.....St. Albans

Dr. Harvey B. Scribner - Commissioner of Education

Dr. Daniel G. O'Connor - Deputy Commissioner

PUBLICATION CREDITS

Published by the Division of Instructional Services
Dr. Karlene V. Russell, Director

Text Prepared by
Allan J. Heath, Chief of Special Projects and
Coordinator Title I, ESEA

Contributing Committee
Marilyn R. Erickson, Education Consultant, Title I
Ray W. Kingsbury, Education Consultant, Title I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	i
PART I - DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY	
Basic Statistics	1
Staff Visits	2
Changes in State Agency Procedures	3
Effect Upon Educational Achievement	4
Effect Upon Administrative Structure and Educational Practices	10
Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged	11
Success of Title I in Non-Public Schools	12
Coordinated Teacher-Teacher Aide Training Programs	13
Community and Parent Involvement	14
PART II - TEST DATA	
Table I - Grade Two	
Table II - Grade Four	
Table III - Grade Six	
Table IV - Grade Eight	

INTRODUCTION

During fiscal year 1969, Title I completed its fourth year of operation of programs designed to meet the critical needs of educationally disadvantaged children in the State of Vermont.

There is now conclusive evidence to support the fact that school administrators and boards of education are recognizing the impact which new instructional techniques and procedures made possible by Title I funds are having on the educational growth of disadvantaged children. Supportive services, likewise, which heretofore have failed to merit public approval and financial justification, are now being recognized as vital to the welfare and normal development of all children, regardless of the level of family income.

The benefits derived from tutorial and small group instruction are contributing to a trend toward reduction of class size. Teachers are recognizing the values to be gained from the use of audio-visual aids and other instructional "hardware" and are becoming more proficient in their manipulation to facilitate learning.

School nurses, home-school social workers, speech therapists, librarian and teacher aides are each making significant contributions in school systems which, prior to the advent of Title I, had been unable to provide for their services. A large majority of LEA's report that should federal support eventually be withdrawn, every effort would be made to continue such services, wherever possible, as a part of their regular school program. The necessity for categorical federal aid will remain paramount, however, as long as critical unmet needs of disadvantaged children continue to demand our attention.

Of particular interest and significance is the trend toward the use of a "Team Approach" in meeting the needs of educationally and culturally deprived children. This is reflected in an introductory statement from the evaluation report of the Chittenden Central Supervisory Union and we quote:

> "Probably the project's greatest achievement during the past ten months has been continual progress towards the adoption of a team approach in helping individual children. With the addition of a speech therapist, the district now employes a social worker, an educational psychologist, school nurses, school guidance personnel and remedial reading teachers. Consequently, by a careful and thorough utilization of all sources of revenue our district has made tremendous strides in the important area of pupil personnel services."

This is a typical example of what is taking place in many areas throughout the state in a concerted and well directed effort toward assessment of the needs of the whole child and a well balanced approach toward meeting them constructively.

PART 1

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

BASIC STATISTICS

1. Basic Title I statistics for Vermont in fiscal 1969 are as follows:

   (a) Number of operating LEA's in the state - 52

   (b) Number of LEA's participating in Title I:

      1. during the regular school term only - 44
      2. during the summer term only - 2
      3. during both the regular and summer terms - 7

   (c) Number of Title I Programs - 53

   (d) Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs:

      1. enrolled in public schools - 13,414
      2. enrolled in non-public schools - 950

In addition to the above enrollees, 107 pre-school and kindergarten children not officially enrolled in either a public or non-public school also participated in Title I programs in 1969.

STAFF VISITS

During Fiscal Year 1969, SEA Title I staff made 99 visits to LEA's participating in Title I.

These visits were designed to fulfill the following objectives:

1. to act as a direct liaison between the State agency and the LEA project Director.

2. to become acquainted with local Title I personnel and to give them a feeling of reassurance and support by the SEA staff in the vital work which they are doing for disadvantaged and handicapped children.

3. to assist with program development.

4. to make on-site evaluation of projects to determine if stated objectives are being met.

5. to observe to what extent effective use is being made of Title I equipment in carrying out instructional and supportive services.

6. to review fiscal accounting procedures and to assist local bookkeepers in the improvement of their accounting operations.

These visits are mutually helpful. Personal observation of on-going projects enables SEA staff members to gain first-hand impressions as to the quality of performance by both teacher and learner, and the degree to which project objectives are being achieved. Outstanding or unusual techniques can be passed on to other Title I personnel who are engaged in similar or related activities.

A written report of each visit is filed with the Title I Coordinator as a matter of record.

CHANGES IN STATE AGENCY PROCEDURES

As was pointed out in our annual report last year, the state has established a minimum or $15,000 for budget approval of any Title I project proposal except in those cases where the maximum grant to an LEA is less than the above amount.

By reducing the number of LEA's from approximately 160 to 85, the size, scope and quality of projects have been improved.

The State agency is now undergoing staff reorganization under which two regional consultants will be engaged full-time in providing field services to LEA's in the northern and southern halves of the state respectively. It is anticipated that this regional coverage will be productive in terms of helping to develop better project proposals; of providing more adequate monitoring of on-going projects; modification of instructional techniques; and in making available to project directors and their staffs lists of materials and bibliographies appropriate for their particular needs.

EFFECTS UPON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

One district reports that a reading, social, emotional, physical, and intellectual development have been most effective: "We have found that the effectiveness of our project increased in direct ratio to involvement. We have broadened our perspective as educators by obtaining points of view from members of other professions. We are also attempting to overcome the "isolation" problem so that there is carry over in the classrooms and homes, and child success is not limited to the 30 minutes he is in special reading class or the 7 hours he is in school. Through involvement, then, we are attempting to insure that the child's total environment provides the opportunity for success and thus fosters a positive self-image and attitude toward others."

A city school system reports that the employment of a social worker has improved parent-school relations: "There is a better liaison between social agencies, and there have been several cases where, because of the social worker, children have been saved." The same school system reports that remedial reading problems have resulted in several changes in attitude toward school and reading at the secondary level has prevented drop-outs. In this city, three Title I projects have been made part of the regular school program, financed by local tax resources. They report, further, that in those components of their projects where small group instruction has been made possible, there has been a substantial improvement in achievement and change in attitude. In the three years of their Title I programs their "expensive" programs have been most effective.

Another district reports that: "The services of the nurse have helped many students with physical handicaps to receive attention needed to alleviate the educational problems caused by the handicaps." In commenting on the effectiveness of their Title I project in relation to cost, this district reports that "a concentration of relatively large sums of money on a small number of pupils has resulted in significant improvement." For example, in Hyde Park with an expenditure of $4,172, 11 children showed an overall improvement of one grade or more in reading.

A large town in Chittenden County reports "the utilization of the school nurse, medical consultative services and mental health services are meeting the needs of the educationally deprived children in this community. The desire to expand all health services on a system-wide basis is certainly indicative of the impact that Title I has had."

As a result of its success with its health services component, this school system has organized a health advisory committee and is setting up a three year system-wide school health program.

A North County Supervisory Union reports that "Careful teacher observation and appraisal gives evidence that a Title I program enriched with self-directive multi-media materials leads to educational achievement and self-improvement of educationally deprived children. The fact that a significant percentage of these pupils return to their normal grade is further evidence of educational advancement."

From Addison County comes a report that "our kindergarten program has had the greatest initial impact. However, the follow-through on health and physical impairment has a great effect on some children. The basic

skills teacher on the secondary level promotes the greatest change in pupils at that level."

A Northeast Kingdom supervisory union reports that "District wide activities seems to have produced best results. Reading assistance during the regular school year, and the library program in the summer have been of real help. The introduction of art and physical education has done much to create a better school curriculum and increased the interest of some children in the overall program."

A union district in central Vermont reports that "since the inception of our program we have had a remedial reading program with a supplementary library service. We feel much has been achieved, particularly in the areas of improved attitudes toward education and improved self-image. Better attendance records, greater socialization, a decrease in behavioral problems and a general improvement in the academic areas support this."

In reporting on his program, a superintendent in Windsor County states that "direct contact with parents and special contact with children has been shown to be most effective. A demonstration that someone really cares, that the individual child can find his place in the group has resulted in better attendance and better self-image. Too often we have assumed problems without getting at the real problem - the child's outlook. Programs which can create mutual respect and self respect contribute greatly towards educational improvement."

A district in Franklin County, in reporting on the effectiveness of activities or combinations of activities has submitted the following comments. "Consultant services have enabled us to view the total school

program 1-12 thereby gaining a greater understanding and acceptance of the deprived child and the influence of deprivation on learning. Health services have enabled us to discover visual and auditory deficiencies and other disabilities. As a result, children function better in classrooms according to the best health information. Our guidance services have located children with emotional difficulties and corrective psychological measures are being effected. Our remedial reading program, according to classroom teachers, enables youngsters to better handle other material in classrooms. In some instances percentiles were raised and this has helped us to locate many difficulties."

A school district in Chittenden County reports that the nursing program has proved of such value that the district has now employed a full-time nurse for all schools.

St. Johnsbury reports that there are fewer children in the school system who are below grade level in reading as the impact of increased assistance is evident. To cite examples, out of 72 children moving into the sixth grade at the Summer Street School only 6 are below grade-level: 2 of these at grade-level 5, and 4 at grade-level 4. Several of these 72 children have been in the Title I program periodically over the past four years.

Because of improved reading skills, there are many more children at each grade level who are able to read at a higher level than would otherwise be possible.

From St. Albans comes the following report: " Concrete evidence as to the worth of the instructional activities and the supportive services

can be found in the current objective tests scores achieved by the participants from 1966 to 1968. The most gratifing success of the program is evident through the children themselves by added class participation and contribution, a growth of attention span, a feeling of importance, and less anxiety - that is a better self-image than would have been obtained by these children without our interest in their growth and achievement."

A report from a district in Washington County points up the fact that the health program which consisted of nutrition, treatment, special clinics etc. has improved attendance and child effectiveness. The teacher-aide program has proved its worth according to a teacher evaluation. Teachers feel that aides are more beneficial than special teachers. The use of school libraries has grown by leaps and bounds due to services offered by the library aide.

A report from the town of Hartford states that "the combination of pre-school screening, pre-school summer school and remedial reading has resulted in the most effective program in improving the educational achievement and/or self-improvement of our children in that it allows us a real opportunity to know more fully their individualized needs and thus more nearly meet them."

The common characteristics of Title I projects in Vermont that seem to be most effective in improving educational achievement are as follows:

1. concentration of large amounts of funds on a small number of children.
2. small group of tutorial instruction
3. the improvement of self-image

4. the improvement of pupil-attitude toward school

5. the improvement of home-school relationships through home-school social workers.

6. correction of speech and other physical impairments

7. the use of the team approach in attacking the critical needs of the whole child

While it is difficult to document the fact through objective evidence that effectiveness is directly related to cost, the general impression which one gets from reading the IEA evaluation reports would point to the fact that where there are sufficient funds to maintain an effective program, the most tangible results are likely to be obtained.

EFFECTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

The trend toward greater emphasis on individualization of instruction which we mentioned in our report last year continues to hold true. There is a concerted effort throughout the State on the part of project directors and other Title I staff personnel to give increased attention to the implementation of this practice.

Supportive services such as health and psychological services, guidance services, home and school counseling, reduction of class size, remedial reading programs and the employment of teacher aides and other para-professionals are now being incorporated into the regular tax-supported school programs.

The State Education Agency, recognizing the need for intensified field services has taken steps to increase its professional staff and to deploy these people in such a way that their services to local agencies will be more readily accessible and effective. The five education consultants in the State Department, more commonly known as "State Helping Teachers," are scheduled to devote one day each week to supervision and evaluation of Title I projects within their respective areas. A close liaison between these consultants and the State Title I Agency is maintained to insure mose effective use of their time on this particular assignment.

ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED

No State funds have been used to augment Title I programs in Vermont. As we pointed out in an earlier section of this report, many school districts throughout the state have assumed responsibility for activities and programs initially funded under Title I grants. The 1969 State Legislature increased dramatically the amount of State Aid for education to the local school districts and I think it can be clearly documented that this increased subsidy has made it possible for local school systems to carry on such programs which heretofore they were unable to do because of limited tax funds. Title I, therefore, has seemed to point the way to the need for improved instructional services and increased supportive services. The public acceptance which they have received is a tribute to the earlier effectiveness of Title I activities at the local level.

SUCCESS OF TITLE I IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Title I has been only moderately successful in bringing compensatory education to children enrolled in non-public schools. In 1969, 950 such children were involved in 22 different projects. These were offered in daytime programs all of which, with one exception, were during the regular school year. In some instances, Title I staff personnel conducted remedial classes in non-public school facilities. In some programs, non-public school pupils came to the public schools to participate in a Title I activity. In two instances Title I programs were conducted in non-public school facilities staffed by personnel from the non-public schools, the activity being under the supervision and direction of the local Title I coordinator.

No particular adaptations were found to be necessary to meet the specific educational needs of these non-public school children. No changes in the legal interpretations, furthermore, were required to clear the way for involvement of these children in publically sponsored Title I projects.

In all cases in which there was joint participation by children from the non-public and public school, officials and staff members from both types of institutions were involved in the joint planning of the project.

Officials of non-public schools have been most appreciative of the opportunity of participating in Title I projects and without exception have cooperated to the fullest degree in helping to make these projects successful.

COORDINATED TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING PROGRAMS

A request for information concerning the above programs was inadvertently omitted from the State evaluation guidelines for fiscal 1969 and unfortunately, therefore, we have no specific data as to the number of such programs which were conducted nor a firm count as to how many professional staff members participated. We are reasonably certain however, that a large majority of LEA's employing teacher-aides in their Title I programs did conduct training programs for the teacher-teacher-aide teams. These programs usually followed the pattern of a series of workshops conducted over a period of several months. Responsibility for these workshops was usually shared jointly by the local superintendent of schools, or his project director, and the State Helping Teacher assigned to this particular area.

COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Over thirty local educational agencies report having an officially organized Title I, ESEA Advisory Committee during the 1968-69 school year. Twenty-eight of these committees were reported to have parent involvement as well as representation from other community organizations. A few LEA's report no significant contributions having been made by their advisory committees while others report varying degrees of success with their respective groups.

Some typical comments relative to advisory committee contributions follows:

"Committee activities have been worthwhile as the parents on the committee give the school this many more contact people to help communicate with other parents."

"Involvement of local group and parents have given us better understanding of our goals and, in the final analysis, has contributed to the success of the project in all areas."

"It has helped everyone concerned with the educational process to become aware of the need to provide more individual attention for those children with learning problems."

"Their participation has made possible better relationships between the public and private school systems, the acceptance of Title I by the faculty and public and support of the project by the LEA."

PART II

TEST DATA

TABLE I

Test Scores - Reading

Grade Two

Name of Test	Pretest or Posttest	Season Administered	Form	Number of Students	Mean Scores		Number of Students Scoring according to National Norms			
					Raw Score	Grade Equiv.	25% and below	26-50%	51-75%	76% & above
Detroit Word Recognition	Pretest	Winter-1968	C	26		2.3				
	Posttest	Spring-1969	D	26		3.1				
Gates-MacGinitie	Pretest	Fall-1968	B-1	21	12		17	4		
	Posttest	Spring-1969	B-2	21	21		17	4		
Metropolitan	Pretest	Fall-1968	A	29	49		6	10	11	2
	Posttest	Spring-1969	B	29	96		5	8	10	6
SRA	Pretest	Fall-1968	D	23		1.5	16	5	2	
	Posttest	Spring-1969	C	23		2.5	13	6	1	
Stanford Achievement	Pretest	Spring-1968	J	56		1.5				
	Posttest	Spring-1969	W	56		2.1				
Stanford Diagnostic Reading	Pretest	Spring-1968	X	61	6.2		61			
	Posttest	Spring-1969	W	61	16.7		55	6		

TABLE II

Test Scores - Reading

Grade IV

Name of Test	Pretest or Posttest	Season Administered	Form	Number of Students	Mean Score		Number of Students Scoring According to National Norms			
					Raw Score	Grade Equiv.	25% and below	26-50%	51-75%	76% and above
California	Pretest	Fall-1968	W	5		3.5				
	Posttest	Spring-1969	X	5		3.6				
Durrell-Sullivan	Pretest	Fall-1968	A	39		3.9				
	Posttest	Spring-1969	B	39						
Gates-MacGinitie	Pretest	Fall-1968	C&D	29	17		17	7	5	
	Posttest	Spring-1969	B&C	29	25		12	8	5	4
Gates Survey	Pretest	Fall-1968	M^1	34	16.4		26	5	1	
	Posttest	Spring-1969	M^2	34	33.3		15	16	3	
Iowa Basic Skills	Pretest	Spring-1968	D	10		2.9	5	4	1	
	Posttest	Spring-1969	D	10		3.4	6	4		
Metropolitan	Pretest	Fall-1968	A&B	19	50.0		6	10	3	
	Posttest	Spring-1969	A&C	19	80.0		7	10	2	

TABLE III

Test Scores - Reading

Grade VI

Name of Test	Pretest or Posttest	Season Administered	Form	Number of Students	Mean Scores		Number of Students Scoring According to National Norms			
					Raw Score	Grade Equiv.	25% and below	25-50%	51-75%	76% and above
California	Pretest	Fall-1968	W	4		4.8				
	Posttest	Spring-1968	X	4		5.5				
Durrell-Sullivan	Pretest	Fall-1968	A	11		5.4				
" "	Posttest	Spring-1969	B	11		6.0				
Gates-MacGinitie	Pretest	Fall-1968	C-1	28	11		19	9		
	Posttest	Spring-1969	C-2	28	16		22	6		
Gates-Survey	Pretest	Fall-1968	M^2	31	36.8		19	12		
	Posttest	Spring-1969	M^2	31	47.2		9	22		
Metropolitan	Pretest	Fall-1968	BM	4	30		4			
	Posttest	Spring-1969	BM	4	35		4			
SRA	Pretest	Fall-1968	D	18		5.3				
	Posttest	Spring-1969	C	18		6.1				
Stanford Achievement	Pretest	Spring-1968	W	20		4.5				
	Posttest	Spring-1969	X	20		5.1				

TABLE IV

Test Scores - Reading

Grade VIII

Name of Test	Pretest or Posttest	Season Administered	Form	Number of Students	Mean Scores		Number of Students Scoring According to National Norms			
					Raw Score	Grade Equiv.	25% or less	26-50%	51-75%	76% and above
SRA	Pretest	Fall-1968	W	17		7.3	5	10	2	
	Posttest	Spring-1969	W	17		7.6	9	4	4	
Stanford Achievement	Pretest	Fall-1968	J	4		4.7				
	Posttest	Spring-1969	X	4		6.8				